

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 16, 2005. The Examiner rejected all claims and objected to the drawings. Applicants hereby amend Fig. 1, cancel claims 1, 2, 9, and 10, without prejudice amend claims 3-8 and 11-16 and add new claims 17-20. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the drawings for not illustrating a feature recited by the claims. Applicants respond by amending Fig. 3 to include a "reception server." Specifically, Fig. 3 has been amended to include the "(Reception Server)" in the vicinity of Ticket Issue Server. This is to reflect that the flow diagram initially indicated as being performed by the Ticket Issue Server alone may be alternatively performed by the Reception Server in combination with the Ticket Issue Server, each server performing different functions. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification including at page 3 paragraph 2, at the first full paragraph of page 5 and the paragraph bridging page 15 and 16.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 9-12 as anticipated by PC Magazine, May 23, 2000 (PC Mag). Claims 1 and 2 were cancelled and claims 3 and 4 were amended so that each of them includes the recitations of claims 1 and 2. Similarly, claims 9 and 10 were cancelled, and 11 and 12 were amended so that each of them includes the recitations of claims 9 and 10. Applicants respectfully contend that as amended newly independent claims 3, 4, 11, and 12 are not anticipated by PC Mag.

The present invention, as set forth in the amended claims, allows a user to receive ticket data on a portable terminal device. The device visibly reproduces the ticket data. The visibly reproduced ticket data allows entry to an event site. In this manner, the present invention not only obviates the need for a physical (paper) ticket but also efficiently facilitates admission to the event site.

Claim 3, recites that the ticket data comprises "script information effective to specify a display mode of the ticket data when the ticket data is visibly reproduced on the display of the

portable terminal device." The Examiner cites footnote 2 of PC Mag as disclosing this recitation. However, there is nothing in footnote 2 that discloses or suggests this recitation.

First, footnote 2 does not disclose script information. All that is displayed is an image or a ticket.

Second, the image of the ticket does not correspond to the recited visible reproduced "ticket data." The recited visible reproduced ticket data validates "entrance to the event site" as set forth in the third paragraph of claim 3. The image of the ticket in footnote 2 does not validate entrance to the event site. Rather, the Bluetooth reader is limited to using radio frequency to communicate with the PDA of PC Mag and validate the voucher. The data transmitted on this wireless signal between the PDA and Bluetooth reader -- and not the image of the ticket on the PDA -- provides entry.

Third, footnote 2 does not disclose or suggest the use of script information to "specify the display mode" of the ticket data. As discussed, footnote 2 does not even disclose script information, let alone information to specify the display mode of the ticket data.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 11 (which has been similarly amended) are not anticipated by PC Mag. New dependent claims 17, 19 are likewise not anticipated for at least some of the reasons set forth above.

Claim 4 recites "reading the ticket data visibly reproduced on the display for determining whether or not the ticket data is authentic." Once again, the Examiner cited footnote 2, but there is nothing in footnote 2 to disclose or suggest this recitation. The Bluetooth reader communicates via wireless signal. Thus, what it scans in the PDA is not the image of the ticket but rather the data transmitted wirelessly between the PDA and the reader. There is nothing in footnote 2 that discloses or suggests that image of ticket on the PDA is read to determine authenticity. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 12 (which is similarly amended are not anticipated by PC Mag. New dependent claims 18 and 20 (which depend from claims 4 and 12 respectively) are likewise not anticipated by PC Mag for at least the reasons provided above.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-8 and 13-16 as obvious in view of PC Mag in combination with U.S Pat. No. 6,175,922 issued to Wang. Applicants respectfully contend that claims 5-8 and 13-16 are patentable over the cited art. Applicants amended claims 5-8 and 13-16 in order to better recite the subject matter, and improve the style of the claims. These amendments were not intended to distinguish from the prior art, or for any other reasons related to patentability.

Independent claims 5 and 13 recite that the ticket data is produced "in a visible or audible form at the event site for validating entrance to the event site." Wang fails to remedy the shortcomings of PC Mag. While Wang does disclose a portable device that includes an optional screen for displaying information, and which can also optionally emit audio information (col. 11, l 54 - col. 12, l 6), these features of the Wang device are only peripheral to the transaction. These features are only used to alert the user of the transaction which is proposed for approval (col. 11, ll. 56, 57). They are not used to actually validate the transaction. Wang uses other communication mediums for validation, such as an infrared communication port (col. 11, ll. 43-45). Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 13 are patentable over PC Mag and Wang.

The Examiner states that Wang discloses password protection which PC Mag does not. Claims 5 and 13 recite accessing a "reception sensor," transmitting a password and an address of a "ticket issue server" to the portable terminal device and then gaining access to the ticket issue server to obtain ticket data. As a preliminary matter, Wang does not disclose the existence of two servers - a reception server and a ticket issue server.

Neither does Wang disclose that the reception server sends "a message comprising a password and an address of the ticket issue server" or having the portable device access the ticket issue server at the address obtained from the message from the reception server and send the password obtained from to the ticket issue server. According to Wang the transaction approval data originates at the portable device and not at a reception server. It is either entered by the user or derived from the user's biometric data (col. 11, l 64 – col. 12, l 18).

Furthermore, Wang is not concerned with obtaining an address of any server. Instead Wang teaches that the portable communications device is directly connected to a requesting device through a communication port (Fig. 2, col. 4, ll. 52-56). Once a direct connection between the two devices is established, addressing is not necessary for communication between them.

For the reasons discussed above PC Mag and Wang do not render independent claims 5 and 13 obvious. Claims 6-8 and 14-16 are patentable because they depend on independent claims 5 and 13, respectively.

Applicants add new claims 17 and 18 to better protect certain aspects of the present invention. Claim 17 is supported by the first full paragraph of page 10 and claim 18 is supported by the first partial paragraph of page 14 of the specification. These indications of support are not meant to be exhaustive; the new claims may be supported by other parts of the application as well.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 393032028500. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Application No.: 09/963,859

16

Docket No.: 393032028500

Dated: November 16, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Hristo I. Vachovsky

Registration No.: 55,694

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

555 West Fifth Street

Los Angeles, California 90013-1024

(213) 892-5790

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicants hereby amend Fig. 3. A replacement sheet is included in Attachment A.